

REMARKS AND APPLICANTS' INTERVIEW SUMMARY

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 26, 2005. Claims 1 to 62 remain in the application. Claims 1, 19, 25, 37, 49, 61 and 62 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies and thoughtful treatment accorded Applicants' undersigned representative during the February 9, 2006 personal interview. This Preliminary Amendment has been prepared in accordance with that interview.

During the interview, the outstanding rejections in which Claims 1 to 12 and 17 to 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,574,655 (Libert) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,415,282 (Mukherjee) were discussed. Specifically, Applicants' undersigned representative explained the differences between the invention and the applied art as follows.

The present invention relates to providing the ability to access *descriptions* of multimedia items from a plurality of content providers. According to the invention, a server receives a request for descriptions of, for example, multimedia items. Although not critical to the claims, multimedia items and their corresponding descriptions may be stored in separate locations, with the metadata server storing the descriptions. The server interprets the request, and accesses the stored descriptions in accordance with the request. When the information is accessed, the metadata server also formulates a return request to the metadata server for further descriptions. Thus, if there are subcategories within the category of the original request, the metadata server, knowing those subcategories, can

formulate an appropriate return request so that information contained within those subcategories can be readily accessed if a user performs an operation to issue a further request. Once the return request has been formulated by the metadata server, the metadata server formats the accessed descriptions to include at least one link that represents the return request, and sends the formatted description to the requestor. The foregoing process has been made clearer by the amendments set forth above, and those amendments were discussed during the interview.

Thus, referring specifically to the amended claim language, Claim 1 is directed to a system for facilitating access to descriptions of multimedia items from a plurality of content providers of the items, wherein information required by the descriptions is stored in corresponding metadata collections associated with the multimedia items, the system comprising (a) a metadata server associated with each the content provider and operable as a description-generating process for communicating with one or more description-receiving processes, each the metadata server being configured, for each the content provider, to perform the steps of (i) receiving a request for the descriptions from one of the description-receiving processes in a predetermined request format, (ii) interpreting the received request according to the predetermined request format, (iii) accessing the information about the multimedia items in the metadata collection of the content provider in response to the interpreted request, (iv) formulating from the information at least one return request to the metadata server for further descriptions, each return request being in the predetermined request format, (v) formatting the accessed information including links representing the at least one return request as a description according to a predetermined scheme, and (vi) sending the formatted description to the

description-receiving process, and (b) at least one the description-receiving process accessible to and operable by potential customers of the content providers and providing the potential customers with a single user interface to access descriptions of multimedia items generated from the multiple metadata servers.

Independent Claims 19 and 25 are also system claims that includes features substantially corresponding to Claim 1, although in somewhat different terminology. Independent Claims 37 and 49 are directed to a metadata/information server itself, while independent Claims 61 and 62 are computer readable medium claims that substantially correspond to Claim 37 and 49, respectively.

As discussed during the interview, the applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1, 19, 25, 37, 49, 61 and 62. In particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a metadata server formulating, information accessed in response to a received request for descriptions of multimedia items/structured information, at least one return request to the metadata server for further descriptions, each return request being in a predetermined request format, formatting the accessed information including links representing the at least one return request as a description according to a predetermined scheme, and sending the formatted description to a description-receiving process.

As discussed at the interview, the Office Action more or less admits that Libert is not seen to disclose various features of the invention. Nonetheless, the Office Action took the position that Mukherjea allegedly discloses the features missing from Libert, but as discussed at the interview, Applicants believe that Mukherjea fails to teach the above features.

In more detail, Mukherjea is seen to disclose that a server receives a request for multimedia items. When the user first issues the request at the client computer, they select a grouping option as to how the search results are to be grouped. In one example disclosed in the patent, the user can select an option to group the search results by the URL that they are retrieved from. In the example disclosed in the patent, if a user enters a request to search for images of an athlete named "Jordan", images are retrieved from multiple websites, including www.nba.com, www.mlb.com, etc. Thus, all images retrieved from nba.com are grouped under a URL representing those search results, while all images retrieved from mlb.com are grouped under a URL representing those search results. When the retrieved results are downloaded to the client computer, a glyph representing the downloaded grouping (shown as the representative URL) is shown on the screen. The user can then select one of the URL glyphs so that downloaded images contained within that grouping are displayed on the screen. The user can then use the already downloaded images to refine their search. Thus, any return request (i.e., a refined search) is generated by the client computer, and no return request for further descriptions is generated by the server of Mukherjea.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of the applied art, all of Claims 1 to 62 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Edward A. Kmett', is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants

Edward A. Kmett

Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 104422v1